

## REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are currently pending in the application. Claims 12, 25 and 31 are hereby cancelled. New claims 34 and 35 are presented for consideration.

Claims 4-6, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 24, 27, 30, 32 and 33 each stand objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. Each one of these claims has been rewritten in independent form so as to be allowable.

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 26, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,676,272 (Chance).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-11, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 26, 28 and 29, and favorable consideration of new claims 34-36 are requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of originally presented claim 12, with an additional characterization of the sensor as a "proximity" sensor. The Examiner cites to the element 20 in Chance as being the allegedly corresponding sensor of claim 12. However, as noted in claims 6-8 in column 4 of Chance, the sensor 20 is a light sensor. The proximity sensor is functional in a very different manner by reason of causing a certain operation of the message system, as when a user approaches, or a vehicle upon which the message system is located approaches an object, wall, etc. It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not find it obvious to use a proximity sensor to realize the attendant advantages based on Chance's disclosure, without the benefit of hindsight with the Applicant's disclosure in hand.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 7-11, 14, 16 and 17 all depend from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the art.

Claim 20 has been amended to include limitations as added to claim 1. For the reasons advanced relative to the allowability of claim 1, claim 20 is likewise believed allowable.

Claims 22, 23, 26, 28, 29 each depend from claim 20 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 34 includes the limitations of originally presented claim 1, and additionally incorporates the limitations of claim 14, as originally filed, with the transmitter/generator

further characterized as being one that can be carried by a user. Chance does not teach or suggest such a transmitter/generator.

Claim 35 includes the limitations of claim 1 and further characterizes the message as comprising information for providing a direction to an observer of the message at the first side of the wall to assist navigation of a space within which the message system is located.

Chance is not concerned with assisting navigation, as clearly no such direction or guidance is required within a hotel/motel room.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-11, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 26, 28 and 29, favorable consideration of new claims 34 and 35, and allowance of the case are requested.

The extra claim fee of \$1200.00 is enclosed. Should additional fees be required in connection with this matter, please charge our deposit account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,  
CLARK & MORTIMER  
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 876-1800

Date: April 8, 2005